

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. This objection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner objects to the limitation of "a current supply line provided over said first substrate and connected with said luminous element via said current control TFT" of Claims 1 and 13, and states that it must be supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported by the present application.

As explained in Amendment B, the current control TFT (431) and its connection to the luminous or EL element of the pixel portion of the claimed light emitting device is discussed, for example, on page 16, ln. 18 - page 17, ln. 17 (of the specification as filed) and shown in Figs. 4A and 4B of the present application. (See also page 11, lns. 16-18 (of the specification as filed) of the present application which discuss the current supply line as a wiring supplying a current that flows to an EL element.) Fig. 2 and page 2, ln. 22 - page 3, ln. 8 (of the specification as filed) of the present application, for example, discuss details of the pixel portion, including the current source line provided over the substrate and connected with the luminous element via the current control TFT.¹ Applicants respectfully submit that it would be clear to one skilled in the art that the above-discussed elements of the structure shown in Fig. 2 would be included within the structure of the figures of the present invention. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the

¹ Applicants are making a minor amendment to the paragraph at page 3, lns. 9-16 to correct typographical and grammatical errors in that paragraph. No new matter is being added so it is requested that this amendment be entered and allowed.

objected to element is supported by the specification and drawings of the present application, and it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objects to the limitations in the claims directed to "the wiring for aiding said current supply line" and states that it must be supported by the specification. In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending the specification at page 11, ln. 21 (of the specification as originally filed) to recite:

The wiring for aiding the current supply line can be made of a metallic film of copper, silver, gold, aluminum or nickel, or an alloy film containing as a main component a material selected from copper, silver, gold, aluminum, or nickel. Also, the wiring for aiding the current supply line can be formed into a layered structure made of a metallic film that is made of two or more different elements selected from copper, silver, gold, aluminum and nickel.

This amendment is supported, for example, by original Claims 3 and 4 of the present application. Hence, no new matter is being added, and it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered, and the objections withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 12

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 12 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 7 to include the limitation of "wherein the luminous element is located between the first substrate and the second substrate".

This feature is, for example, shown on page 6, ln. 24 - page 7, ln. 15 (of the specification as originally filed) and Fig. 1 of the present application.

This feature is clearly not disclosed or suggested in Yamada which shows the alleged luminous element 11b over the alleged first substrate 14 and alleged second substrate 14c. Hence, the claims are patentable over this reference, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13-15, 17 and 18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13-15, 17 and 18 under 35 USC §102(e) as being unpatentable over Ohtani et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 13 to include the limitation of "wherein the luminous element is located between the first substrate and the second substrate". As explained above, this feature is, for example, shown on page 6, ln. 24 - page 7, ln. 15 (of the specification as originally filed) and Fig. 1 of the present application.

Applicants do not believe that this feature is disclosed or suggested in Ohtani. Hence, the claims are patentable over this reference, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 4 and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada and further in view of Masutani et al. and rejects Claim 16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohtani and further in view of Masutani. Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500